

III. Rejection of Claims 5-7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Action first rejects claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly lacking a patentable utility. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The present application describes a novel G-protein coupled receptor (GPCR). Of the pharmaceutical products currently being market by the entire industry, 60% of these drugs target G-protein coupled receptors (Gurrath, 2001, *Curr. Med. Chem.* 8:1605-1648). Given that more than half of the currently marketed drugs target proteins that are structurally (7TM proteins) and functionally (G-protein interaction) related to the presently described sequences, a preponderance of the evidence clearly weighs in favor of Applicants' assertion that the presently described sequences have a specific (the claimed GPCR proteins are encoded by a specific locus on the human genome), credible, and well-established utility.

The Action questions prediction of protein function based upon protein homology, citing Bork and Koonin (1998, *Nature Genetics* 18:313-318). However, Bork and Koonin themselves conclude "(i)n summary, the currently available methods for sequence analysis are sophisticated, and while further improvements will certainly ensue, they are already capable of extracting subtle but functionally relevant signals from protein sequences (Bork and Koonin, page 317). Thus, the Bork and Koonin article is hardly indicative of a high level of uncertainty in assigning function based on sequence, and thus does not support the alleged lack of utility.

The Action goes on to question asserted utility based upon such protein homology, citing Ji *et al.* (1998, *J. Biol. Chem.* 273:17299-17302; "Ji") and Yan *et al.* (2000, *Science* 290:523-527; "Yan") to support this argument. But an exact quote from Ji completely undermines this argument: "a substantial degree of amino acid homology is found between members of a particular subfamily, but comparisons between subfamilies show significantly less or no similarity" (Ji at 17299, first paragraph, emphasis added). This quote suggests that homology with members of a G-protein coupled receptor is indicative that the particular sequence is in fact a member of that subfamily - the fact that there is little or no homology between subfamilies is completely irrelevant. Furthermore, regarding Yan, this paper cites only one example, two isoforms of the anhidrotic ectodermal dysplasia (EDA) gene, where a two amino acid change conforms one isoform (EDA-A1) into the second isoform (EDA-A2). However, while it is true that this

amino acid change results in binding to different receptors, it is important to note that the different receptors bound by the two isoforms are in fact related (Yan at page 523). Furthermore, the EDA-A2 receptor was correctly identified as a member of the tumor necrosis factor receptor superfamily based solely on sequence similarity (Yan at page 523). Thus, Yan does not suggest a high level of uncertainty in assigning function based on sequence, and thus also does not support the alleged lack of utility.

Rather, as set forth by the Federal Circuit, “(t)he threshold of utility is not high: An invention is ‘useful’ under section 101 if it is capable of providing some identifiable benefit.” *Juicy Whip Inc. v. Orange Bang Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citing *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 534 (1966)). Additionally, the Federal Circuit has stated that “(t)o violate § 101 the claimed device must be totally incapable of achieving a useful result.” *Brooktree Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, 977 F.2d 1555, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1992), emphasis added. *Cross v. Iizuka* (224 USPQ 739 (Fed. Cir. 1985); “*Cross*”) states “any utility of the claimed compounds is sufficient to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101”. *Cross* at 748, emphasis added. Indeed, the Federal Circuit recently emphatically confirmed that “anything under the sun that is made by man” is patentable (*State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1998), citing the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Diamond vs. Chakrabarty*, 206 USPQ 193 (S.Ct. 1980)).

In *In re Brana*, (34 USPQ2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1995), “*Brana*”), the Federal Circuit admonished the P.T.O. for confusing “the requirements under the law for obtaining a patent with the requirements for obtaining government approval to market a particular drug for human consumption”. *Brana* at 1442. The Federal Circuit went on to state:

At issue in this case is an important question of the legal constraints on patent office examination practice and policy. The question is, with regard to pharmaceutical inventions, what must the applicant provide regarding the practical utility or usefulness of the invention for which patent protection is sought. This is not a new issue; it is one which we would have thought had been settled by case law years ago.

Brana at 1439, emphasis added. The choice of the phrase “utility or usefulness” in the foregoing quotation is highly pertinent. The Federal Circuit is evidently using “utility” to refer to rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and is using “usefulness” to refer to rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

This is made evident in the continuing text in *Brana*, which explains the correlation between 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph. The Federal Circuit concluded:

FDA approval, however, is not a prerequisite for finding a compound useful within the meaning of the patent laws. Usefulness in patent law, and in particular in the context of pharmaceutical inventions, necessarily includes the expectation of further research and development. The stage at which an invention in this field becomes useful is well before it is ready to be administered to humans. Were we to require Phase II testing in order to prove utility, the associated costs would prevent many companies from obtaining patent protection on promising new inventions, thereby eliminating an incentive to pursue, through research and development, potential cures in many crucial areas such as the treatment of cancer.

Brana at 1442-1443, citations omitted. The Examiner states that “further research would be required” in certain aspects of the present invention (Action at page 5). However, even if, *arguendo*, further research might be required in certain aspects of the present invention, this does not preclude a finding that the invention has utility, as set forth by the Federal Circuit’s holding in *Brana*, which clearly states, as highlighted in the quote above, that “pharmaceutical inventions, necessarily includes the expectation of further research and development” (*Brana* at 1442-1443, emphasis added). In assessing the question of whether undue experimentation would be required in order to practice the claimed invention, the key term is “undue”, not “experimentation”. *In re Angstadt and Griffin*, 190 USPQ 214 (CCPA 1976). The need for some experimentation does not render the claimed invention unpatentable. Indeed, a considerable amount of experimentation may be permissible if such experimentation is routinely practiced in the art. *In re Angstadt and Griffin, supra*; *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As a matter of law, it is well settled that a patent need not disclose what is well known in the art. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The present invention has a number of substantial and credible utilities, not the least of which is, as taught in the specification as originally filed, at least at page 6, lines 15-17, the claimed polynucleotide sequences can be used to track the expression of the gene encoding the described protein. In particular, the specification describes how the described sequence can be represented using a gene chip format to provide a high throughput analysis of the level of gene expression. Such “DNA chips” clearly have utility,

as evidenced by hundreds of issued U.S. Patents, as exemplified by U.S. Patent Nos. 5,445,934, 5,556,752, 5,744,305, 5,837,832, 6,156,501 and 6,261,776. Evidence of the “real world” substantial utility of the present invention is further provided by the fact that there is an entire industry established based on the use of gene sequences or fragments thereof in a gene chip format. Perhaps the most notable gene chip company is Affymetrix. However, there are many companies which have, at one time or another, concentrated on the use of gene sequences or fragments, in gene chip and non-gene chip formats, for example: Gene Logic, ABI-Perkin-Elmer, HySeq and Incyte. In addition, two such companies (Agilent acquired by American Home Products and Rosetta acquired by Merck) were viewed to have such “real world” value that they were acquired by large pharmaceutical companies for significant sums of money. The “real world” substantial industrial utility of gene sequences or fragments would, therefore, appear to be widespread and well established. Clearly, there can be no doubt that the skilled artisan would know how to use the presently claimed sequences (see Section IV, below), strongly arguing that the claimed sequences have utility. Given the widespread utility of such “gene chip” methods using *public domain* gene sequence information, there can be little doubt that the use of the presently described *novel* sequences would have great utility in such DNA chip applications. As the present sequences are specific markers of the human genome, and such specific markers are targets for the discovery of drugs that are associated with human disease, as described above, those of skill in the art would instantly recognize that the present nucleotide sequences would be ideal, novel candidates for assessing gene expression using such DNA chips. Clearly, compositions that enhance the utility of such DNA chips, such as the presently claimed nucleotide sequences, must in themselves be useful. Thus, the present claims clearly meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Although Applicants need only make one credible assertion of utility to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 (*Raytheon v. Roper*, 220 USPQ 592 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Gottlieb*, 140 USPQ 665 (CCPA 1964); *In re Malachowski*, 189 USPQ 432 (CCPA 1976); *Hoffman v. Klaus*, 9 USPQ2d 1657 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1988)), as a further example of the utility of the presently claimed polynucleotide, the present nucleotide sequence has a specific utility in mapping the protein encoding regions of the corresponding human chromosome, as described in the specification as originally filed, at least at page 3,

line 8. Clearly, the present polynucleotide provides exquisite specificity in localizing the specific region of the human chromosome containing the gene encoding the given polynucleotide, a utility not shared by virtually any other nucleic acid sequences. In fact, it is this specificity that makes this particular sequence so useful. Early gene mapping techniques relied on methods such as Giemsa staining to identify regions of chromosomes. However, such techniques produced genetic maps with a resolution of only 5 to 10 megabases, far too low to be of much help in identifying specific genes involved in disease. The skilled artisan readily appreciates the significant benefit afforded by markers that map a specific locus of the human genome, such as the present nucleic acid sequence.

Furthermore, persons of skill in the art, as well as thousands of venture capitalists and investors, readily recognize the utility, both scientific and commercial, of genomic data in general, and specifically human genomic data. Billions of dollars have been invested in the human genome project, resulting in useful genomic data (see, *e.g.*, Venter *et al.*, Science, 2001, 291:1304). The results have been a stunning success, as the utility of human genomic data has been widely recognized as a great gift to humanity (see, *e.g.*, Jasny and Kennedy, 2001, Science 291:1153). Clearly, the usefulness of human genomic data, such as the presently claimed nucleic acid molecules, is substantial and credible (worthy of billions of dollars and the creation of numerous companies focused on such information) and well-established (the utility of human genomic information has been clearly understood for many years).

Finally, the requirements set forth in the Action for compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 101 do not comply with the requirements set forth by the Patent and Trademark Office (“the PTO”) itself for compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 101. The PTO has issued numerous patents on polynucleotide sequences that have not been directly shown to be associated “with any disease or condition”, the condition apparently set forth by the Examiner as allegedly necessary to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101. As examples of such issued U.S. Patents, the Examiner is invited to review U.S. Patent Nos. 5,817,479, 5,654,173, and 5,552,2812 (each of which claims short polynucleotide fragments), and recently issued U.S. Patent No. 6,340,583 (which includes no working examples), none of which contain examples of the “real-world” utilities that the Examiner seems to be requiring in the present Action. Additionally, the Office has recently issued U.S. Patent 6,043,052, which concerns an “orphan” G-Protein coupled receptor identified based

only on homology to the orphan receptor GPR25, similar to the situation with Applicants' currently claimed sequence. Importantly, this issued patent also contains no examples of the "real world" utilities seemingly required in the present case. As issued U.S. Patents are presumed to meet all of the requirements for patentability, including 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph (see Section IV, below), Applicants submit that the presently claimed polynucleotide must also meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Holding Applicants to a different standard of utility would be arbitrary and capricious, and, like other clear violations of due process, cannot stand.

For each of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that as the presently claimed nucleic acid molecules have been shown to have a substantial, specific, credible and well-established utility, the rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 5-7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Action next rejects claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, since allegedly one skilled in the art would not know how to use the invention, as the invention allegedly is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or a well-established utility. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants submit that as claims 5-7 have been shown to have "a specific, substantial, and credible utility", as detailed in section III above, the present rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, cannot stand.

Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Action next rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

The Action rejects claim 5 as allegedly indefinite based on the term "stringent hybridization conditions", because the specific hybridization and washing conditions are not recited in the claim. Applicants stress that "a claim need not 'describe' the invention, such description being the role of the

disclosure". *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986). However, while Applicants submit that the term is sufficiently definite, as a number of stringent hybridization conditions are defined in the specification and would be known to those of skill in the art, solely in order to progress the case more rapidly toward allowance the claim has been revised to recite specific highly stringent hybridization conditions. As the specification provides specific teaching regarding such highly stringent hybridization conditions, at least at page 5, lines 4-11, Applicants submit that revised claim 5 even more clearly meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants therefore request withdrawal of this rejection.

VI. Conclusion

The present document is a full and complete response to the Action. In conclusion, Applicants submit that, in light of the foregoing remarks, the present case is in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested. Should Examiner Li have any questions or comments, or believe that certain amendments of the claims might serve to improve their clarity, a telephone call to the undersigned Applicants' representative is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

December 2, 2002

Date

David W. Hibler

David W. Hibler
Agent for Applicants

Reg. No. 41,071

LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED
(281) 863-3399



24231

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE